

REMARKS

This paper is being provided in response to the Office Action dated March 28, 2006 for the above-referenced application.

The rejection of Claims 1, 5-6, 17, 21-22, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pouban et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,104,718, hereinafter referred to as "Pouban") in view of Brackett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,632, hereinafter referred to as "Brackett") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,871 to Atkin et al. (hereinafter "Atkin") is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of providing multiple jobs for a first communication device that exchanges data with a second communication device. The method is recited as including providing a plurality of device records, where each of the device records corresponds to the first communication device; providing a plurality of job records for at least one of the device records, where each of the job records contains at least some information that is also provided in the corresponding one of the device records and where at least one of the job records corresponds to tasks performed in connection with exchanging data between the first communication device and the second communication device, and linking the job records and the corresponding device record so that any one of the job records may be accessed by first accessing the corresponding one of the device records, where jobs corresponding to the job records associated with a

particular device record are serviceable by different entities. Claims 2-6 and 27 depend from Claim 1.

Claim 17 recites computer software that provides multiple jobs for a first communication device that exchanges data with a second communication device. The software is recited as including executable code that provides a plurality of device records, where each of the device records corresponds to the first communication device; executable code that provides a plurality of job records for at least one of the device records, where each of the job records contains at least some information that is also provided in the corresponding one of the device records and where at least one of the job records corresponds to tasks performed in connection with exchanging data between the first communication device and the second communication device, and executable code that links the job records and the corresponding device record so that any one of the job records may be accessed by first accessing the corresponding one of the device records, where jobs corresponding to the job records associated with a particular device record are serviceable by different entities. Claims 18-22 depend from Claim 17.

Poublan discloses providing multiple jobs for a device associated with a communication device. As indicated at item 3 of the Office Action, Poublan does not teach that the job records contain information that is also provided in the corresponding one of the device records and exchanging data between the two communication devices.

The Office Action also indicates at item 3 that Brackett teaches having job records containing information that is also provided in the corresponding one of the device records for a system that communicates with multiple remotely located storage or printing devices as set forth at column 5, lines 30-33, column 8, lines 5-16, Fig. 2, Fig. 6 and 8.

The Office Action further indicates that Atkins discloses an input/output adaptor for connection disk units, for example, and that Atkins also discloses another entity such as a communication adaptor, wherein it transfers data and links the device with hundreds or even thousands of similar devices such as remote printers, remote services, or remote storage units.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Pouban, nor Brackett, nor Atkins, nor any combination thereof show, teach, or suggest the feature recited in the claims where jobs corresponding to the job records associated with a particular device record are serviceable by different entities. This feature of the present claimed invention allows operations for a device to be handled more quickly and efficiently by allowing multiple entities (including entities that are relatively idle) to assist. For example, in the case of a background copy operation, the associated jobs may be handled by multiple entities, thus allowing the background copy operation to complete sooner.

In contrast, none of the cited reference appears to address or even recognize this problem solved by the present claimed invention. Pouban does not teach that the job

records contain information that is also provided in the corresponding one of the device records, and thus there does not appear to be any mechanism in Poublan for having an entity other than the device itself service job records for the device. Furthermore, even if Brackett teaches having job records containing information that is also provided in the corresponding one of the device records for a system that communicates with multiple remotely located storage or printing devices, there still is no teaching whatsoever in Brackett of having the job records of a particular device being able to be serviced by multiple entities. Data structures like those described in the present specification are used to make jobs for one device be serviceable by other entities. No such data structure (or anything that could perform the same or similar function) is described in Brackett. Note that having the job records serviced *by* multiple entities is different and distinguishable from having the job records relate to communication by the device *to* multiple entities.

In addition, the Office Action indicates, on page 3 thereof, that Poublan and Brackett are silent with respect to jobs corresponding to the job records associated with a particular device record being serviceable by different entities, as recited in the claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Atkins does not overcome this deficiency of Poublan and Brackett. In the first place, even though Atkins teaches use of a communication adaptor (34), Atkins does not appear to teach job records for servicing the adaptor. In contrast, the present independent claims clearly recite providing a plurality of job records wherein at least one of the job records corresponds to tasks performed in connection with exchanging data. Atkins is silent regarding detailed operation of the communication

adaptor (34) and it is not clear whether any sort of job record (or equivalent) is used at all in Atkins.

In addition, Atkins discloses only one processor (10) and thus, even if Atkins disclosed jobs as recited in the present claims (which Applicants dispute), Atkins discloses only the processor (10) that could possibly service those jobs. Thus, in contrast with the present claims that recite the jobs being serviced by different entities, Atkins discloses only a single entity that could service any jobs. Furthermore, even though Atkins mentions in passing that the computer system has "at least one processor", Atkins never otherwise discusses more than processor and certainly never mentions how more than one processor could service the communication device (34). In fact, it's not clear whether Atkins ever mentions the processor (10) itself being used to operate any aspect of the communication device (34).

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 2-4 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pouban in view of Brackett and further in view of James (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,376, hereinafter referred to as "James"), is hereby traversed and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Poublan and Brackett are summarized above. Furthermore, since claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 18-20 depend from independent claim 17, then Applicants assume that this rejection includes Atkins, which was used to reject claims 1 and 17.

James discloses a system for converting between the states of fresh and owned in a multiprocessor computer system comprising a memory line with a structure including a first field for storing a memory state, a second field for storing an address and a third field for storing data. (See Abstract). James relates to a system and method for maintaining cache coherence that is even driven and changes the state of the caches and memories based on the current memory state and a head of a list of corresponding cache entries. (Col. 1, Lines 17-23).

Applicant respectfully submits that the deficiencies of Poublan, Brackett, and Atkins with respect to the independent claims 1 and 17, discussed above, are not overcome by the addition of the James reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections and objections. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 508-898-8603.

Respectfully submitted,
MUIRHEAD AND SATURNELLI, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Donald W. Muirhead', written over a horizontal line.

Donald W. Muirhead
Registration No. 33,978

Date: June 6, 2006

Muirhead and Saturnelli, LLC
200 Friberg Parkway, Suite 1001
Westborough, MA 01581
Phone: (508) 898-8601
Fax: (508) 898-8602